

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION**

KIM CAMILLE FLORENCE,	:	
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
V.	:	
	:	NO. 4:23-cv-00125-CDL-MSH
Sheriff GREG COUNTRYMAN,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	
	:	

ORDER

Currently pending before this Court is Petitioner Kim Camille Florence’s motion for reconsideration of this Court’s order (ECF No. 21) adopting the United States Magistrate Judge’s order (ECF No. 16) denying several of Petitioner’s motions, including her motions for injunctive relief. Mot. for Recon., ECF No. 22. Motions for reconsideration are not to “be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga. Local R. 7.6. Instead, reconsideration is only appropriate when “(1) there has been an intervening change in the law; (2) new and previously unavailable evidence has been discovered through the exercise of due diligence; or (3) the court made a clear error of law.” *Fla. Found. Seed Producers, Inc. v. Ga. Farms Servs., Inc.*, 977 F. Supp. 2d 1336 (M.D. Ga. 2013).

In the motion for reconsideration, Petitioner notes that this Court’s order stated that no objection had been received, but Petitioner asserts that she had timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge’s order. Mot. for Recon. 2, ECF No. 22. As was noted in the order denying leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*, between the entry of the Magistrate

Judge's recommendation that Petitioner's motions be denied and this Court's order adopting that motion, Petitioner filed several motions and a recast petition. Mot. for Hearing, ECF No. 17; Mot. for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, ECF No. 18; Mot. for Recusal, ECF No. 19; Recast Petition, ECF No. 20. On page 9 of the document Petitioner labeled as a "Recast Memorandum," Petitioner included a section she headed "Motions With Objections." *See* Mot. for Recusal 9, ECF No. 19. It appears that Petitioner may be referring to this section when she states that the Court did receive objections from her.

In that section, however, Petitioner did not include any actual objections to the recommendation relating to her injunctive relief motions. *See id.* Instead, she moved for the Magistrate Judge to be recused from this case on the grounds that he is "too biased, too partial, and abusing discretion in an attempt to delay order for writ of release." *Id.* Petitioner then went on to list orders that she apparently wanted the Court to enter, including a restraining order against the respondents and an order requiring her immediate release. *Id.* at 9-10.

Petitioner renews these objections in the motion for reconsideration and again calls for the Magistrate Judge's recusal. Mot. for Recon. 8-9, ECF No. 22. For the same reasons set forth in the order denying leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*, Petitioner's request for the Magistrate Judge's recusal is **DENIED**. Moreover, nothing in Petitioner's objections or the motion for reconsideration warrants any change to the Court's order adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

Therefore, Petitioner's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 22) is also **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 3rd day of January, 2024.

S/Clay D. Land

CLAY D. LAND

U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA